DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 304 UD 030 294

TITLE	Parent Involvement Program, 1991-92 Evaluation. OER Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Educational Research.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	72p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Educational Research, Research Unit, Board of Education of the City of New York, 110 Livingston Street, Room 507, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Cultural Differences; Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Parent Child Relationship; Parent Education; *Parent Participation; Parent Role; *Partnerships in Education; Program Evaluation; Selection; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City Board of Education; *Parent Involvement Program NY

ABSTRACT

The New York City Board of Education established the Parent Involvement Program (PIP) in 1987. The goal of the program was to enhance the home-school partnership and optimize the parent-child relationship to maximize educational success for children. By 1992 the program had expanded to more than 90 sites in schools and in communities at large. The 1992-93 evaluation of the PIP included review of program documents, observation of activities, and surveys of program coordinators to determine whether the PIP is being implemented as intended. Program sites varied greatly in terms of the activities implemented and were most successful when they involved the development of skills, acknowledged the cultural diversity of parents, promoted better parent-child relationships, and provided support services like child care. Recommendations for program continuation and improvement include the need for site selection that encompasses support services and improved financial support and evaluation. Five tables present evaluation data. Appendix A contains an overview and information about site implementation. Appendix B contains the PIP coordinator survey. (Contains 15 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 304

OER Report

EVALUATION OF THE 1991-92 PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Tobias
NC Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION OF THE 1991-92
PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Carol A. Gresser
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Louis DeSario
Sandra E. Lerner
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra-Vélez
William C. Thompson, Jr.
Members

Tiffany Raspberry
Student Advisory Member

Ramon C. Cortines
Chancellor

8/1/94

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City School District of the City of New York not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Frederick A. Hill, Jr., Director (Acting), Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone (718) 935-3320

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND DESIGN

Educational research provides ample evidence that schools, families, and communities all benefit from parent involvement in their children's education. Parent involvement is important across racial and economic lines and age groups. The level of parent involvement also affects student academic performance. More specifically, studies indicate that for at-risk children, inner-city youth, and immigrant children, closer ties between school and family are crucial to a child's progress. In recognition of the vital role of parents in the education of children, the New York City Board of Education established the Parent Involvement Program (PIP) in 1987. The goal of the program was to enhance the home/school partnership and optimize the parent/child relationship in order to maximize educational success for children. The program, which started with some thirty sites in 1987, had expanded to more than 90 sites by 1992. These sites are located in individual schools, community school districts, and high school and special education superintendencies, and also in the community at large.

PROGRAM FINDINGS

The director of the Office of Parent Involvement requested that the New York City Board of Education's Office of Educational Research (O.E.R.) evaluate the 1991-92 PIP. O.E.R.'s review of program documents, observation of program activities, and survey of program coordinators indicated that the PIP was implemented as intended. Implementation was particularly successful at sites where parents' concerns and needs were taken into account in the planning and development of the program.

Program sites varied greatly in terms of activities implemented, and were most successful when they involved the development of skills, acknowledged the cultural diversity of parents, promoted better relationships between parents and their children, provided support services like childcare, and were held at convenient convening times.

Many PIP site coordinators stressed the need to start the program earlier in the school year and to release funds in a more timely fashion. They complained about having to spend money out-of-pocket. In addition, site visit observations indicated that implementation at a few sites was hampered by space and time constraints. These logistical obstacles to program implementation possibly could have been off-set by O.P.I. establishing a formal mechanism for veteran program sites to assist and communicate with first-year program sites.

Program benefits and impact were formally assessed through coordinator survey responses and informally by speaking to program participants during O.E.R. site visits. Overall, these data confirmed that, after five years of implementation in the New York City Public Schools, PIP has:

- increased the number of parents involved in the school;
- affected student behavior; and
- enhanced the relationship and cooperation of the school staff with families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of these findings, O.E.R. makes two types of recommendations. The first is related to the proposal selection process; the second concerns the structure and evaluation of future programs.

Proposal Selection Criteria

O.E.R. recommends that future program site selection criteria include indications of:

- provision of support services like child care and translation;
- program activities that reflect cultural diversity of the site;
- program activities that focus on parental skill development; and
- objectives that promote stronger links with other existing parent involvement activities held at the site.

Future Program Structure and Evaluations

On the basis of the program structure and processes findings, O.E.R. recommends that the Office of Parent Involvement should:

- endeavor to pair experienced PIP staff and parents with their counterparts in new programs that serve similar parent populations, needs, and concerns to provide technical assistance and share ideas on an on-going basis;
- seek to develop a more flexible and timely schedule for the release of program funds to avoid program implementation delays and coordinator out-of-pocket expense;

- seek to evaluate: 1) participants' perceptions of program benefits; 2) the impact of PIP on the overall level of parent involvement in the school system; and 3) the relationship and impact of PIP on pre-existing parent involvement initiatives--i.e., PAs/PTAs, school-based management/shared decision-making programs, etc.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by the Research Unit of Board of Education of the City of New York's Office of Educational Research (O.E.R.) under the supervision of Mabel Payne, Manager of the unit. As with all reports coming from this unit, this one represents the contributions of many people.

Lisa Abramson, Ph.D. and Carolyn Jarvis of O.E.R. developed ideas, methods, and the evaluation model used, including the implementation index and PIP coordinator survey. Data analysis for the 1991-92 section was done by Carolle Charles and L. Abramson.

Evaluation activities were coordinated by Carolle Charles, Ph. D. Additional O.E.R. staff who collected, compiled, and analyzed field data included: Patricia DeArcy, Edgar Knispel, Radhika Phillip-Moustakas, James Reeves II, Belinda Rowe, and Catherine Scott. Adeola Joda provided invaluable technical support. Report preparation was conducted by Carolle Charles, Ph.D. and Pamela Wheaton. Renee Moseley and Adetokunbo Sosanya provided help with the word-processing and formatting of the text.

Valuable assistance for the evaluation research was provided by the Office of Parent Involvement. We wish to thank the Director, Edna Suarez-Colomba, and the Parent Involvement Program (PIP) Coordinator, Ali Calabrese. Thanks also go to all PIP coordinators, principals, school district personnel, teachers, and families who participated in PIP activities for their cooperation. They were most generous with their time and input.

Additional copies of this report are available from:

Ms. Mabel Payne
Office of Educational Research
Research Unit
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street, Room 507
Brooklyn, New York 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
PROGRAM HISTORY	3
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	5
PROGRAM GOALS	6
SCOPE OF THIS REPORT	8
II. METHODOLOGY	9
EVALUATION PROCEDURES	9
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES	9
III. PROGRAM FINDINGS	12
OVERALL FEATURES OF THE PIP SITES	12
O.E.R. SITE VISIT OBSERVATIONS	16
PARENTING SKILL ACTIVITIES	18
PERCEPTION OF PROGRAM IMPACT FROM O.E.R. SURVEY RESPONSES	27
IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
CONCLUSIONS	31
RECOMMENDATIONS	32
APPENDIX A	34
OVERVIEW	35
IMPLEMENTATION INDEX	36
CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS	36
SITE CONDITIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION	43
CONCLUSION	44
APPENDIX B	45
REFERENCES	56

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Summary of Parent Involvement Program.	8
Table 2	Summary of 1991-92 Evaluation Sample Sites . . .	10
Table 3	Summary of Activities Offered at O.E.R. Sample Sites.	14
Table 4	Percentage Target Populations.	15
Table 5	Summary of Study Sample Site Visits.	17
APPENDIX Table 1	Summary of Selected Measures of Program Implementation	37
APPENDIX Table 2	Summary of Implementation Indexes and Funding For Selected Sample Sites 41	

I. INTRODUCTION

"Trying to educate children without the involvement of their family is like trying to play a basketball game without all the players on the court."
Senator Bill Bradley, New Jersey*

"It takes the whole village to raise a child."
African proverb

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Schools, families, and community all benefit from parental involvement in their children's education. Research studies increasingly report that schools which open their doors to families and reach out to their communities are reaping the benefits (Henning-Stout and Goode, 1986; Brandt, 1989; Wikelund, 1990; Henderson, 1991; Edwards and Jones Young, 1992).

> The success of parent involvement efforts has been measured by assessing effects on parent attitudes, I.Q. gains, self-concept and achievement scores, and school-community interaction. Positive relationships between and among each of these outcome measures and parent involvement have been demonstrated (Henning-Stout and Goode, 1986, p.73).

> The evidence is clear that parental encouragement, activities, and interest at home and participation in schools and classrooms affect children's achievements, attitudes and aspirations, even after student ability and family socioeconomic status are taken into account. Students gain in personal and academic development if their families emphasize schooling, let the children know they do, and do so continually over the school years (Epstein, 1987, p.120).

Traditionally, the scope of parent involvement in school activities consisted primarily of "bake sales" and fund-raising activities. In recent years, the concept has broadened to include programs that integrate parents into the school program and attempt to build a strong relationship between school, family,

---

*Cited by Karen R. Wikelund, 1990. Schools and Communities Together: A Guide to Parent Involvement., p. 5.

and the larger community. These programs "encompass a wider range of family/school/community/learner partnerships" (Davies, 1991; Seeley et al., 1991). The new interpretation recognizes that family is a more representative term than parent, and that the participation of community agencies and institutions which serve children is also important for children's full development. Parent involvement programs have also become part of a national movement toward increasing decision-making authority at the school level.

Parent involvement is important across racial and economic lines and age groups. It is as essential in middle school and high school as it is in the early elementary years (Wikelund, 1990).

Much recent research has focused on the relationship between low-income, or inner-city, youth and the family's involvement in school. There is some indication that the lack of parent involvement can actually jeopardize a child's academic success (Comer, 1988). If children are not convinced that their parents believe in the importance of education, they are more likely to drop out.

Parents are their children's earliest teachers and their role as such clearly does not stop when their children enter school (Wikelund et al., 1990).

> The more parents can understand and support what teachers do, the more they can help their children. The greater the positive relationship between teachers and parents in what they say and do about children learning, the more powerful their mutual influence can be upon children (Wlodkowski and Jaynes, 1990:pp 10).

PROGRAM HISTORY

1987-88 School Year

The Parent Involvement Program (PIP) in the Board of Education (BOE) of the City of New York began in 1987 while Richard Green was chancellor. The City of New York provided an $800,000 grant for PIP's first year. The City's comptroller earmarked $200,000 for a Parent Orientation Program (POP) and the BOE allocated the remainder to two other components: a community-based organization (C.B.O.), and individual schools and districts.

The 1987-88 PIP program was evaluated jointly by Fordham University's Graduate School of Education and the Institute for Responsive Education*. The evaluation team concluded that the first year of PIP was a "remarkable success" and that "the program should be continued and expanded" (Jackson et. al, "Parents Make a Difference," 1988).

1988-89 School Year

For the 1988-89 school year, funding by New York City for PIP was increased by $200,000, bringing the total grant to $1,000,000. The BOE distributed a Request for Proposals (R.F.P.) at the beginning of the school year, seeking applications for parent involvement grants. The R.F.P specified that PIP sites needed to focus on hard-to-reach parents--those who have seldom, if ever, participated in school activities.

---

*The Institute for Responsive Education is a Boston-based, private, non-profit organization which studies and advocates parent participation in education.

After reviewing proposals, the BOE granted $600,000 to 20 individual schools and eight districtwide or boroughwide components, $200,000 to five Parent Orientation Programs continuing from 1987-88, and $200,000 to two community- based organizations--specifically, Advocates for Children, and the Church Avenue Merchants Block Association.

The Office of Educational Research (O.E.R.) conducted an evaluation of the program to determine how well its goals were met. The evaluators* reported that PIP was successful in achieving all three program goals: enhancing the home/school partnership, optimizing the parent/child relationship, and maximizing success for children.

1989-90 School Year

The 1989-90 school year was the first year that PIP was run by the newly established Office of Parent Involvement (O.P.I.) at the BOE's headquarters. The program had previously been run by the Office of Community School District Affairs. No formal evaluation of PIP was done for the 1989-90 program year.

1990-91 School Year

The 1990-91 school year brought further growth to the Parent Involvement Program. A total of 265 proposals were received and were reviewed by 17 three-person teams. These teams included: (1) parent advocates and leaders; (2) O.P.I. staff and BOE employees; and, (3) representatives of unions and C.B.O.'s.

---

*For more detailed information from this evaluation, read the OREA Report, Parent Involvement Program (PIP) 1988-89.

Funding for PIP was allocated at two different times in the school year. Sites receiving funding in November were designated as Cycle I sites and those receiving funding in March were designated as Cycle II sites. At the end of November 1990, 68 Cycle I sites were given grants totalling $913,742. In March 1991, an additional $206,646 was awarded to 21 Cycle II sites, bringing the total number of sites to 89, and the total funding to $1,120,388. O.P.I. specified that Cycle I sites be implemented from November 1990 through June 1991 and that Cycle II sites be implemented from March 1991 through June 1991. O.E.R. evaluated this school year's program and developed several evaluation instruments and a technical index* in order to assess program implementation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In 1991-92, the PIP program received funding from the federal Chapter 1 program, from the New York State Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (P.C.E.N.) program, and from the State Chapter 2 program, enabling it to serve parents of pupils in schools in poverty income-level areas and/or to serve poverty income-level students with or without remedial academic needs. This change in sources of funding underscored the N.Y.C. Public Schools' recognition that children from these target populations especially benefit from their families' involvement in their schools.

---

*See Appendix A for complete information on this index.

Moreover, in the R.F.P. issued in September 1991, Chancellor Joseph A. Fernandez recognized what research has documented:

> Long-term educational success is rooted in the bond between home and school established early in a child's education. Active and continuing participation by parents is essential to improving student academic achievement and self-esteem.

PROGRAM GOALS

The R.F.P. stated that the 1991-92 goals of PIP should be mutually determined by parents and school staff and should also:

- promote maximum success for students;
- enable parents to better understand the educational system;
- promote opportunities for parents and school personnel to join together in the educational process;
- promote parent outreach to involve parents in the school life of their children;
- enable parents to recognize the need to optimize the parent/child relationship and develop skills to help their own children; and
- promote community involvement in the schools and the utilization of the enriched resources of the community.

The R.F.P. provided guidelines to help parents and school staff determine the goals and objectives for their program site, and suggested specific activities to accomplish them. It also mandated that "programs should reflect the multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual diversity of the student and parent populations . . ."

As in the previous year, individual elementary, middle, and high schools could submit proposals for grants from $5,000 to $10,000, while community school districts and high school and special education superintendencies were allowed up to $40,000.

O.P.I. offered a technical assistance workshop, as it had in previous years, to help schools and districts prepare their proposals. By mid-October 1991, O.P.I. had received 265 grant proposals. During a two-tier evaluation process, 18 teams of four to five people reviewed the applications. Members of these proposal review teams included:

- employees of the N.Y.C. Public Schools;
- C.B.O. representatives;
- United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.) members:
- parent representatives from the same parent groups as the previous year, as well as parents who attended the Parent Institute*; and
- members of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators.

Grants totalling $982,594 were awarded to 92 program sites, with slightly over half of the funding going to 65 individual school programs and substantially the same number of citywide special education and high school superintendency sites. Table 1 indicates the distribution of PIP funds to the different types of 1991-92 sites. The program was to be implemented from November 1991 through June 1992, and funds were not allowed to be carried over into the 1992-93 school year.

---

* The Parent Institute is a program established since 1990 by the Office of Parent Involvement in cooperation with Pace University. A cross-section of parents from all the boroughs are invited to Pace University to participate in workshops, presentations, and displays of materials on parent involvement. Moreover, the most successful Parent Involvement Programs throughout the city are showcased.

Table 1

Summary of 1991-92 Parent Involvement Program
Sites and Funding Distributions

Site Types	Number of Sites	% of Total Sites	Total Amount Funded	% of Total Funds
Community School Districts	11	12.0	$198,762	20.4
Superintendencies	5	5.4	100,096	10.1
Citywide Special Education	11	12.0	125,893	12.8
Individual elementary, middle and high schools	65	70.6	557,843	56.7
TOTAL:	92	100.0	982,594	100.0

- Individual schools represented more than half of the total sites receiving PIP funding.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report presents a summary of the 1991-92 PIP evaluation and focuses on the implementation of a sample of parent involvement program sites in the BOE. The report identifies variations in program characteristics, and explores the impact of some of these features on program implementation.

Chapter I provides an introduction to the report. Chapter II describes the methodology used and the questions addressed in the evaluation. Chapter III presents evaluation findings. O.E.R.'s conclusions and recommendations to the O.P.I. are contained in Chapter IV. Appendix A summarizes the development and application of a technical implementation index, and Appendix B provides a copy of the O.E.R.-developed "School Coordinator Survey."

II. METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Studies indicate that it is necessary to understand the implementation process of a parent involvement program in order to fairly assess the outcome of that program (Henderson 1988, McLaughlin 1987, Epstein 1991). This evaluation therefore focuses on assessing how the program was implemented at a sample of PIP sites.

PIP implementation at a site was defined as:

- the extent to which PIP activities took place as planned;
- the extent of parent participation in program activities; and
- the perceived benefits of PIP to the parents and the site.

These features were assessed by: 1) reviewing program records; 2) observing site activities and conducting informal interviews of program coordinators, parents, and principals at these activities; and 3) administering an O.E.R. developed survey to coordinators of each site in the sample.*

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Number and Type of Sample Sites

Table 2 summarizes the type and number of PIP sites in the 1991-92 evaluation sample.

---

*A more rigorous program implementation analysis was attempted by applying a theoretical model developed for the 1990-1991 O.E.R. PIP evaluation. However, the model did not provide any further insight into program implementation than the descriptive observational and perceptual methods. Therefore, the findings related to the application of this model are presented in Appendix A.

Type of Site	Number of Schools	Number of C.S.D.s	Number of Superintendencies
Elementary & Middle Schools	23	16	0
High Schools	10	0	4
Districtwide	18	5	0
Citywide Special Education	7	0	1
Total:	58	21	5

- About 40 percent of the sites sampled were elementary and middle schools, about 30 percent were at the district or superintendency level, 17 percent were high schools, and 12 percent were special education sites.

Evaluators selected a block-random sample which proportionately included different types of sites (elementary, middle, high, or special education school), implementing agencies (school, community school district, or superintendency), boroughs, target populations (immigrants, minorities, bilingual, etc.), and types of activities. The sample included 23 individual school sites in 16 community school districts, ten high schools in four superintendency-sponsored sites, 18 schools in five districtwide program sites, and seven schools sponsored by the citywide special education superintendency; the 58 sites were located throughout the five boroughs of New York City.

Site Visit Procedures

O.E.R. staff visited 22 program sites. Evaluators observed program activities; informally interviewed PIP coordinators, parents, and principals when possible; and wrote site visit reports which included a description of events and participants, general observations of the site, and the observer's impression of the status of the program.

III. PROGRAM FINDINGS

Program findings are presented in three parts: (1) a summary of the general features of program sites; (2) a summary of O.E.R. staff's observations during site visits; and, (3) a summary of PIP coordinators' responses to selected O.E.R. survey questions.

OVERALL FEATURES OF THE PIP SITES

Percent of Grants Awarded to Schools and Districts

In 1991-92, 56.7 percent of the grants were awarded to individual schools (65), while 43.3 percent of the grants were given to community school district (11), high school superintendency (5), and citywide special education sites (11). The total allocation for all PIP sites was $982,594.

O.E.R. selected 58 sites for evaluation, of which 56 (96.6 percent) responded to the survey. Therefore, all findings are based on the data collected from the 56 responding sites. Total funding for these sites was $344,499 and ranged from $500 to $25,000 per site, with an average grant award of $6,152. Most sites did not use their total grant, with each only spending an average of about $5,800 (94.3 percent of their total funding). Moreover, 54.5 percent (32) of the sample sites were individual school projects, while 45.5 percent (26) were district-/ superintendency-sponsored sites.

Number of Activities Implemented

Sites' records indicated that the total number of activities held ranged from a minimum of three to a maximum of 305. On

average, the sample sites held 43 activities and implemented an average of 67 percent of their proposed activities. In addition, more than one third (n = 26) of the 56 sites surveyed implemented activities that were not included in their proposals.

Parent Attendance

Data from program activity sheets showed that the total number of parents attending PIP activities ranged from four to 1,329 parents. On average, each activity/event at a site was attended by 15 parents.

School and District Sites' Activities

School-grant sites tended to favor different types of activities than did district-grant sites. As Table 3 illustrates, the five activities which were most likely to be offered at school-grant sites were:

- child care (86.7 percent of the sites offering child care were school-based);
- field trips (76.9 percent of the sites offering field trips were school-based);
- workshops in parent/child relations (76.5 percent);
- family relations (60.5 percent); and
- resource room (55 percent).

District-sponsored sites more frequently conducted:

- parent hotlines (81.3 percent of the sites which had telephone hotlines for parents were district-level grants);
- leadership training (66.7 percent);
- parent support groups/workshops (66.7 percent);
- home education techniques (61.1 percent); and

Table 3
1991-1992 Parent Involvement Program
Summary of Activities Offered
at O.E.R. Sample Sites in School and District-Sponsored Programs

TYPE OF ACTIVITY	TOTAL NUMBER OF SITES IMPLEMENTING EACH ACTIVITY	SCHOOL-SPONSORED SITES' ACTIVITIES %	N	DISTRICT-SPONSORED SITES' ACTIVITIES %	N
Hotline	16	18.8	3	81.2	13
Leadership Training	18	33.3	6	66.7	12
Parent Support	36	33.3	12	66.7	24
English as a Second Language	36	38.9	14	61.1	22
Home Education Techniques	36	38.9	14	61.1	22
Parent Volunteering	26	42.3	11	57.7	15
Handbook	18	44.4	8	55.6	10
Newsletter	40	45.0	18	55.0	22
Translation	45	51.1	23	55.0	22
Library	23	52.2	12	47.8	11
Continuing Education	32	53.1	17	46.9	15
Resource Room	29	55.2	16	44.8	13
Family Relation	43	60.5	26	39.5	17
Parent/Child Relation Workshops	34	76.5	26	23.5	8
Field Trips	13	76.9	10	23.3	3
Child Care	15	86.7	13	13.3	2

* Percentages are based on the total number of sites in the sample implementing each activity.

- School-sponsored sites tended to offer different types of activities than district-sponsored sites.

- E.S.L. workshops (61.1 percent).

School-grant programs tended to hold more weekend activities with 90.9 percent of the weekend activities occurring at school-sponsored sites.

Target Populations

Target populations for district- and school-sponsored sites showed some variation based on the type of program, as summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
Percentage Designating Particular Target Populations
by School and District Sites

Target Population	% School Sites	% District Sites
All Parents	51.9	48.1
Elementary	75.0	25.0
E.S.L.	59.1	40.9
At-Risk Students	16.7	83.3
Other	37.9	62.1

- While parents of elementary school students (75 percent) were the most targeted group at school-sponsored sites, district-sponsored sites most frequently (83.3 percent) targeted parents of at-risk students.

The percentages in Table 4 were based on the 30 school sites and 28 district* sites that identified target populations. At least 50 percent of the school sites identified three target groups, whereas only two target groups were identified by more than 50 percent of the district sites.

*District programs also refer to high school superintendency programs.

Program Funding

Most sites surveyed for the evaluation received their funds in January 1991. Many started activities late. In some instances coordinators reported that they had to use their own money to begin PIP activities due to the tardy disbursement of PIP funds.

O.E.R. SITE VISIT OBSERVATIONS

Overview

For a broader perspective and understanding of PIP in the 1991-92 school year, evaluators conducted site visit observations, informal interviews with parents and coordinators, and administered open-ended survey questions to determine PIP coordinators' perceptions of the program's benefits.

O.E.R. evaluators made 32 site visits during May and June of 1992 to 21 program sites. In some cases more than one evaluator visited a particular site. Table 5 summarizes the types of sites visited and the activities observed. Based on the data in Table 5, three types of activities predominated among the PIP sites visited:

- parenting skill activities, including family relations, parent-child activities, parent support, and home education techniques;
- skill development activities, including continuing education and E.S.L. classes; and
- child care.

PARENTING SKILL ACTIVITIES

Workshops on Family Relations

More than three-quarters (76.7 percent) of all sample sites offered workshops in family relations. As indicated in Table 5, O.E.R. researchers visited eight sites which conducted this activity. Of the eight, three sites (F, K, and L) were individual school programs, four sites (B, N, S, and T) were district programs, and one site (G) was a citywide special education program.

Family relations workshops covered a wide range of issues. For example, one high school held a series of "Anger Management" workshops which focused on helping parents and adolescents identify and deal with stress and problems in their relationship. These evening workshops consistently attracted about 20 parents and nine students. On two site visits, the O.E.R. evaluator found the sessions to be well-organized and the participants enthusiastic, staying on after the scheduled ending time to continue talking outside. One mother commented,

> This workshop has given me hope that my son and I can be friends. I was an abused wife for 14 years and an abusive mother for ten. I know now I will not lose him and we both know I'm a safer parent.

A father remarked that his wife had encouraged him to attend the workshop because she was tired of him fighting with their 16-year-old daughter. Now, he noted, he realizes that when children grow older, they have to make their own choices. "We don't own our children," he said. His daughter said that she had learned to communicate with her father more openly and honestly.

Evaluators also visited an evening workshop on single parenting at a Queens elementary school. Thirty parents attended, 28 of them women. A consultant from a community-based organization led the workshop, and all parents had the opportunity to speak from their personal experience. Many of them knew each other from previous workshops and spoke freely. According to the PIP coordinator, a key ingredient of parent participation at these weekly workshops was that the topics were selected according to parents' needs. Most parents indicated that childcare was also a decisive factor for their participation. The evaluator found the program "remarkably well-organized and implemented."

At the same time, workshops on family relations were not always successful, as an O.E.R. site visit to an elementary school revealed. In this instance, the event was a daytime workshop held in the teachers' lunchroom and led by an outside consultant. The topic was "disciplining your child." The program began late; participants straggled in--some with toddlers in tow--and parents did not seem engaged by the presentation. There was little participation on their part. One participant said this workshop was "okay. This topic is not so helpful to me. I received no [new] news."

O.E.R. evaluators also visited a districtwide program that sponsored a series of eight workshops on family relations for 10 elementary and middle schools. This series of workshops, held at the district's newly inaugurated parent resource room, was not a

success. Only one mother was present for most of the sessions visited. The coordinator indicated that attendance had been low, or at best sporadic, throughout the series. No childcare was offered at the site, although children were welcome to play in a corner of the room, the coordinator said. Nevertheless, the young mother of six who was present saw this as an opportunity to "get away from the tensions at home." She had attended other PIP sessions at the school and had volunteered to be corresponding secretary of the P.T.A.

Another parenting activity in this same district--specifically, a session on planning for summer vacation--seemed more successful in terms of attracting parent attendance and interest. The one-time workshop was offered at each participating school in the district, and attendance ranged from four to 16 parents at the various schools. On the day of the site visit, 15 parents, men and women from a variety of racial and ethnic background groups and nationalities, attended. Some had their young children in tow. Most appeared to appreciate the hands-on activities, game-playing, and concrete suggestions for summer activities that were proffered. Door prizes were offered to the first five parents to arrive, and there was also a raffle. It was a morning workshop, held from 9-11 a.m. in the P.T.A. room.

The PIP coordinator was gratified by the turnout and said that next year she would continue to offer incentives and services which would encourage people to attend: inexpensive door

prizes, raffles, craft activities, plus hand-outs and written materials for parents. "If that's what works, that's what we'll do," she said. The PTA president, one of the few parents who had been consistently active at the school, concurred. "You have to offer them something for coming up," she said. "You have to teach them something or offer door prizes."

Other parents were enthusiastic about the workshop in written evaluations: "I like the fact that the little ones were able to do things with us." "I liked learning games to play with the kids." "It was a warm encouraging atmosphere." "It was nice to socialize and meet new people."

Another mother interviewed by O.E.R. said that she was now convinced that parental participation in the school helped the child. She mentioned the commercial on television which says, "Show me a parent who cares and I'll show you a kid who can learn." She admitted that she had never been involved with her older children in school but planned to do better with her first-grader. "He's proud that I help him with his learning," she said. "He tells his friends about it."

Parent/Child Activities

Sixty-three percent of all sample sites offered parent/child activities. Eight of the program sites visited by O.E.R.(C, E, J, K, M, N, O, and R) offered parent/child activities.

One after-school crafts program for families and their elementary school children visited by evaluators met its goal, as stated in the school's proposal, of attracting a wide range of

families representing many cultures, especially immigrant families. Parents and children alike said they enjoyed the opportunity to meet families from different cultures. However, the assistant principal at the site felt the program would be even more effective if it began at the beginning of the year. But, he said that if it grew much larger, "I don't know if we could accommodate it."

Another parent-child activity visited by O.E.R. evaluators were evening workshops on nutrition and health sponsored by a high school superintendency. On the two occasions that an O.E.R. evaluator visited the site, there were between 30-40 participants, but it was unclear how many were actually parents. Approximately half of the participants were students who were attending the workshop for course credit. Six participants on both evenings were senior citizens. One parent interviewed said that participation in P.T.A. and other school activities had not increased because of PIP. When asked what she thought could be done about this, she responded, "Plan more programs that they like."

Parent Support Workshops

Workshops categorized as parent support activities were held at 65 percent of the sample sites. Of the 21 programs visited by evaluators, four (sites I, K, L, and P) held this kind of activity. Often the theme of a workshop on parent support did not really differ from that of family relations, and in fact, both belonged to the general category of parenting skill activities.

At a citywide special education elementary school for children with learning disabilities and emotional problems, the PIP activities focused on helping parents learn more about their children's handicapping conditions and how to deal effectively with them. This was done through the technique of role-playing at a workshop led by representatives from a community-based organization. Parents were fully engaged in role-playing, hands-on activities, and interaction with the leaders. These workshops were held in the evening and attracted both men and women of different ethnic groups. Childcare was provided. Parents said they benefitted from sharing from other families in like situations. One parent stated, "My seven-year-old son has serious behavior problems. This workshop has taught me how to handle it. Once again I have a social life and can take my son in public."

At another special education site, weekly parent support groups attracted a group of 20 to 25 parents and their children, representing a socioeconomic and ethnic mix of men and women. In after-school sessions, parents met to share information with one another and to give mutual support on issues relating to caring for autistic and emotionally disturbed children. While the parents met informally with the leader (a teacher at the school), their children were upstairs in a supervised gym program. The agenda allowed time for personal sharing as well as listening to a guest speaker or learning about a specific topic.

The PIP coordinator said the parents took the lead in planning their weekly meetings and that he was the facilitator. According to him, the same parents who were active in the P.T.A. were those who attended weekly PIP meetings--in fact, he said, attendance at PIP was sometimes higher than at P.T.A. Attendance had gone down at other school functions, he said, even though parents were offered stipends for attending.

Workshops on Home-Education Techniques

While workshops on family relations, parent-child activities, and parent support focused on the emotional aspects of parenting skills, workshops on home-education techniques attempted to develop the teaching skills of parents. An O.E.R. researcher visited two workshops (sites C and E) on family math.

At one of the sites, a Brooklyn elementary school, the program was not implemented because the PIP coordinator went on medical leave early in the year and was not replaced, which caused the program to forfeit some of its funding. Nonetheless, the parents took charge of the program. They held a series of three Saturday morning workshops which attracted approximately 40 families. Parents and children seemed to thoroughly enjoy working together in a hands-on activity. One parent who was there with her second grader said, "My daughter has math anxiety. I am terrible with numbers so we decided to do this jointly. We like doing things together."

E.S.L. Workshops and Related Activities

E.S.L. and related workshops were offered at 65 percent of the sites in the sample, and researchers visited three of these

sites. Two were school-based programs (sites H and O) and one was district-based (site J).

The workshops seemed to attract a small, consistent group of parents, usually female and from the same ethnic background. The same was true of a literacy program which was visited. One school in the districtwide program had a regular group of six Muslim women who attended the weekly workshops. While the women worked on math drills and life skills, their children, pre-school through elementary school-aged, were supervised in learning activities in the same room.

One teacher said the workshops had increased parents' awareness of what their children were doing in school and helped parents realize that they had the right to ask questions of their children's teachers. Parents often felt intimidated by the school, she said, and the goal of the program was not only to increase their language skills but to enable them to feel confident in talking with the school administration. The teacher reported that these parents were now participating more in school activities. Parents and children wanted this program to last longer. "I wish this class were every day," said one child.

O.E.R. evaluators visited a similar program at a large elementary school with 2,000 students. The PIP program, which included a literacy component and a small lending library, consistently attracted about 10 parents to the class. On the June afternoon that it was visited by evaluators, six women attended. All were very appreciative, especially of the homework

help given to their children. The children's component had been added to the program, the coordinator said, when it became evident there was a need for it.

Continuing Education Workshops

More than half the PIP sample sites (57 percent) held continuing education and related workshops. One program in a middle school which was visited by an evaluator (site A) seemed successful in terms of the number of parents attending and the enthusiasm expressed by these parents. Two workshops, a math and a computer class, were being held. There were 25 parents in each of the workshops. The coordinator repeated that these parents regularly participated in the workshops, which were held three times a week for several months. Once again, parents and the coordinator stressed the importance of activities being offered for children simultaneously with parent workshops.

Child Care

As observed at many PIP sites, the provision of child-care seemed essential to the success of a program. Children and their siblings could participate in the after-school program and parents could attend the PIP activities. Parents said they welcomed this integration. One parent said, "Schools need to have more programs where parents can feel they are important--not just lectures. Up to now there wasn't another program here. The children need to have activities. To eat and play. Our child is enjoying himself. He shows off when he comes here and he knows we are here."

Multi-cultural Fairs

Two of the programs visited (sites D and F) offered large one-time events, such as international or multi-cultural fairs. The fairs attracted hundreds of families. It was impossible to determine, however, whether those parents who participated were involved in an ongoing basis in PIP, P.T.A., parent-teacher conferences, or other regular activities. In all cases, it was clear that large numbers of parents enjoyed these events.

PERCEPTION OF PROGRAM IMPACT FROM O.E.R. SURVEY RESPONSES

Achievements and benefits of the sites' activities were also assessed through PIP coordinators' responses to three open-ended O.E.R. survey questions.* These questions asked the coordinators to evaluate the:

1) level of success and/failure of their program;
2) reasons for the success of implementation; and
3) benefits of the program for the school and the staff.

O.E.R. evaluators also informally asked parents to assess the benefits of the programs during site visits. Data collected from the coordinator survey questions and from informal conversations with parents indicated that the various sites' programs were generally perceived to be successful, despite certain obstacles.

---

* These are questions 14, 15, and 16 on the survey in Appendix B.

Perception of Benefits

Overall assessment. The majority of PIP coordinators (65.4 percent) responding to the O.E.R. survey rated PIP as "very successful". Twenty-four of the 32 respondents (75 percent) indicated that the program was vital to their school, 15 out of 43 respondents (34.9 percent) indicated that parents felt more empowered, 21 out of 43 respondents (48.8 percent) pointed to increased attendance at PIP workshops, and 9.3 percent said that parents volunteered more time in school activities. One-third (30 percent) of the respondents stated that cooperation between staff and parents had improved.

School/home partnerships. PIP coordinators also noted benefits to their schools and school personnel. Thirty out of 47 respondents (63.8 percent) felt that PIP had helped improve communication and cooperation between home and school, 18 out of 47 (38.3 percent) said that parents were more informed and more confident, 7 (14.9 percent) indicated that staff better understood the importance of PIP in the children's education, and 5 (10.6 percent) pointed out that students' behavior had improved.

Many coordinators mentioned how the number of parents involved in the school had increased, since PIP began. One coordinator noted that "attendance at meetings and school functions increased, the level of interaction between school and parents, particularly non-English speaking, increased, and the number of PTA members and parent volunteers increased."

Likewise, several coordinators mentioned the greater bond that had developed between school and parents. One wrote in the survey:

> There has been greater bonding, positive attitudes, and working partnerships between staff and parents since there were so many opportunities to communicate and share ideas and experience.

Another wrote:

> It provided an opportunity for our staff to better understand the needs and concerns of our parents and how that impacts on the children we teach. A bond is created during these PIP sessions which is strengthened during the school year and is the catalyst for other parents to attend and encouraging them to become more involved.

Another elementary school coordinator wrote on the survey,

> Parents are not afraid to come to school now that they have a PIP outreach worker . . . the parent takes pride in sharing his/her cultural heritage with the child's class. The child has pride in his culture. Children throughout the school have had the opportunity to share their culture and/or experience with others. This is great for self-esteem.

Perception of Obstacles

Most of the coordinators tended to give a positive account of PIP and the implementation process, but some also indicated obstacles. In particular, the process of obtaining funds and materials was complicated for many coordinators. Thirty-seven out of 58 (63 percent) coordinators considered "the distribution of funds in a timely manner" as the greatest common obstacle to the process, and 26 out of 58 (44 percent) respondents listed the "procedures of accessing funds" as one of the problematic features. Several coordinators suggested that O.P.I. establish a petty cash fund to eliminate coordinators having to spend out-of-

pocket funds while waiting for the districts to disburse funds. Interestingly, fewer than 25 percent of the coordinators mentioned the amount of funding provided as a major obstacle. Other features that seemed to constitute a problem in developing the program were "too little parent participation in planning the program" and the "late starting date of the program." The former was mentioned as an obstacle by 25.4 percent of the coordinators, while 39 percent indicated that the program started too late during the school year.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The Parent Involvement Program (PIP) is an established and well-defined program which has evolved into a complex network of activities encompassing a wide range of parent/family, school, and community partnerships. Although the program provides an opportunity for parents to be involved in their children's schools and to participate in the educational system, its scope is limited by not tapping into the resources and relationships established by pre-existing parent involvement initiatives at the program sites.

Programs varied greatly in terms of the activities involved. However, in general, the most successful activities involved the development of skills, acknowledged the cultural diversity of parents, promoted better relationships between parents and their children, provided support services like childcare, and were held at convenient convening times.

Many PIP site coordinators stressed the need to start the program earlier in the school year and to release funds in a more timely fashion. They complained about having to spend money out-of-pocket. In addition, site visit observations indicated that implementation at a few sites was hampered by space and time constraints. These logistical obstacles to program implementation possibly could have been off-set by O.P.I. establishing a formal mechanism for veteran program sites to assist and communicate with first-year program sites.

Program benefits and impact were formally assessed through coordinator survey responses and informally by speaking to program participants during O.E.R. site visits. Overall, these data confirmed that, after five years of implementation in the New York City Public Schools, PIP has:

- increased the number of parents involved in the school;
- affected student behavior; and
- enhanced the relationship and cooperation of the school staff with families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of these findings, O.E.R. makes two types of recommendations. The first is related to the proposal selection process; the second concerns the structure and evaluation of future programs.

Proposal Selection Criteria

O.E.R. recommends that future program site selection criteria include indications of:

- provision of support services like child care and translation;
- program activities that reflect the cultural diversity of the site;
- program activities that focus on parents' skill development; and
- objectives that promote stronger links with other existing parent involvement activities held at the site.

Future Program Structure and Evaluations

On the basis of the program structure and processes findings, O.E.R. recommends that the Office of Parent Involvement should:

- endeavor to pair experienced PIP staff and parents with their counterparts in new programs that serve similar parent populations, needs, and concerns to provide technical assistance and share ideas on an on-going basis;

- seek to develop a more flexible and timely schedule for the release of program funds to avoid program implementation delays and coordinator out-of-pocket expense;

- seek to formally evaluate: 1) participants' perceptions of program benefits; 2) the impact of PIP on the overall level of parent involvement in the school system; and 3) the relationship to and impact of PIP on pre-existing parent involvement initiatives--i.e., PAs/PTAs, school-based management/shared decision-making programs, etc.

APPENDIX A

IMPLEMENTATION INDEX

DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION

APPENDIX A

OVERVIEW

This evaluation investigated the types of program characteristics affecting implementation, and the social and administrative conditions at the school and district/ superintendency level facilitating a more successful implementation. Program characteristics included methods of formulating and implementing programs, participation of parents in planning, the types of activities offered, and funding considerations. Conditions at the school level comprised factors such as the principal's support, the demographic and social characteristics of the school population, and the participation of the school in the school-based management/shared decision making (S.B.M./S.D.M.) program,* while conditions at the district level included, among other things, parent involvement in policy formation, school board support, district size, and district and/or superintendency office support.

PIP implementation at a site was defined as:

- the extent to which PIP activities took place as planned;
- the extent of parent participation in program activities; and
- the perceived benefits of PIP to the parents and the site.

---

*SBM/SDM is a school management option that is based on the belief that students, parents, school staff members, and communities have unique needs that can only be identified and addressed by them. All these constituent groups collaborate to establish policies and procedures of the school. Moreover, since parents are defined as the first and primary educators of their children, a strong partnership between home and school is considered essential for the success of the program.

IMPLEMENTATION INDEX

Evaluators developed an implementation index that measured the extent of activity and parent participation, and provided a means of ranking program sites. The index consisted of five measures for each site:

1) the total number of activities implemented;
2) the percentage of the site's proposed activities represented;
3) the total number of parents in attendance at the activities;
4) the percentage of the site's parent population that the total attendees represented; and
5) the average percentage of parents participating in program activities.

These data were compiled from each site's proposal and from the coordinators' survey. All measures were converted to standard scores and then added together to obtain an implementation index.

Appendix Table 1 provides the implementation index of the O.E.R. sample sites and two component measures. It was postulated that sites that scored high on the index would have better program implementation than those that scored low. Indexes ranged from 2.69 to -.69, with an average value of .02. Of the 57 sample sites, only 37 percent (21) had positive implementation index values.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Overview

One of the goals of the evaluation was to find out if there was a relationship between successful implementation, program characteristics, and conditions related to program sites.

APPENDIX TABLE 1[a]
1991-1992 Parent Involvement Program
Summary of Selected Measures of Sample Sites' Implementation Index by Rank Order

Rank Order	Site Type[b]	Implementation Index	Average No. of Activities Implemented	Average No. of Parents Participating in Activities
1	S	2.69	5	194.90
2	S	1.38	305	2.23
3	S	1.34	257	3.42
4	S	1.12	82	16.21
5	D	0.56	13	59.70
6	S	0.52	8	93.50
7	S	0.37	16	22.68
8	D	0.35	30	22.60
9	S	0.31	40	11.22
10	D	0.20	115	.57
11	S	0.20	115	.57
12	S	0.17	31	12.04
13	S	0.17	25	21.96
14	S	0.15	152	.43
15	S	0.14	50	4.84
16	S	0.10	37	13.35
17	S	0.08	30	21.96
18	S	0.06	25	19.72
19	S	0.05	22	13.92
20	D	0.01	17	33.05
21	D	[c]	3	22.33
22	S	-0.01	6	18.50
23	S	-0.01	21	11.95

[a] Data for this table were obtained from proposals and coordinator's O.E.R.-survey responses.

[b] "S" means School-sponsored and "D" means District-sponsored program sites.

[c] Component scores were not available for this site; therefore no index could be developed.

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE 1[a]
(Continued)

Rank Order	Site Type[b]	Implementation Index	Average No. of Activities Implemented	Average No. of Parents Participating in Activities
24	D	-0.02	17	5.64
25	S	-0.03	21	6.05
26	S	-0.05	18	6.17
27	S	-0.08	25	11.00
28	S	-0.08	13	11.62
29	D	-0.09	61	.93
30	S	-0.09	66	4.52
31	S	-0.10	22	2.86
32	D	-0.11	60	1.20
33	D	-0.11	26	17.04
34	D	-0.13	20	2.25
35	D	-0.13	91	7.00
36	S	-0.15	57	.98
37	S	-0.18	57	1.05
38	S	-0.19	13	15.92
39	D	-0.21	55	.53
40	D	-0.21	51	6.02
41	D	-0.23	54	.16
42	D	-0.23	54	.30
43	D	-0.24	54	.16
44	D	-0.24	55	.16
45	D	-0.25	7	35.40

[a] Data for this table were obtained from proposals and coordinator's O.E.R.-survey responses.

[b] "S" means School-sponsored and "D" means District-sponsored program sites.

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE 1[a]
(Continued)

Rank Order	Site Type[b]	Implementation Index	Average No. of Activities Implemented	Average No. of Parents Participating in Activities
46	D	-0.26	55	.65
47	D	-0.26	40	1.78
48	D	-0.34	30	1.90
49	D	-0.35	35	8.91
50	S	-0.35	28	9.71
51	S	-0.41	18	6.17
52	S	-0.46	12	4.00
53	S	-0.54	10	4.00
54	D	-0.57	8	9.12
55	D	-0.65	18	4.50
56	D	-0.67	11	.36
57	S	-0.69	14	.78

[a] Data for this table were obtained from proposals and coordinator's O.E.R.-survey responses.

[b] "S" means School-sponsored and "D" means District-sponsored program sites.

- Of the 57 sample sites, only 37 percent (21) had positive implementation indexes.

The latter included: types of program (school or district)*, amount of funding, level of parent participation in a school, types of activities, school staff support, and parent networking.

The relationship between these factors was tested through five hypotheses. Three hypotheses dealt with program characteristics and two examined conditions related to program sites. Hypotheses were used to measure implementation because they enabled the evaluation of how and why, given certain conditions, a program performed well. In addition, they also permitted the assessment of weaknesses, limits, and constraints to full implementation.

Program Sponsorship

Hypothesis one tested whether programs which originated at the individual school level tended to be more successfully implemented than those that originated on the district level.

Appendix Table 2 displays a selection of 12 sites. These sites are clustered into groups based on their implementation index score. The four sites with the highest implementation index were grouped as "Sites with High Index." Four sites with an implementation index closest to the average score were grouped as "Sites with Medium Index," and the four sites with the lowest implementation scores were grouped as "Sites with Low Index."

The four programs in the table that showed a high implementation index were school-grant programs. In contrast,

---

*District programs also refer to high school superintendency programs.

APPENDIX TABLE 2

1991-1992 PIP
Summary of Implementation Indexes and Funding Data
For Selected Sample Sites*

Site Sponsor	Site's Implementation Index	Total Funding Received	Spending Patterns: Material Funds Amount	Material Funds % Spent	Personnel Funds Amount	Personnel Funds % Spent
		Sites with High Index				
School	2.69	7,500	1,891	25.2	5,609	74.8
School	1.38	14,000	14,000	100.0	-----	
School	1.34	5,000	160	3.2	4,840	96.8
School	1.12	9,000	2,015	22.4	6,985	77.6
		Sites with Average Index				
School	0.06	5,000	2,650	53.0	2,236	47.0
School	0.05	5,000	2,999	60.1	2,001	39.9
District	0.01	8,000	2,351	29.4	4,900	70.6
District	-0.01	9,000	2,148	31.1	5,973	68.9
		Sites with Low Index				
District	-0.57	4,900	756	15.3	4,199	84.7
District	-0.65	9,000	9,000	100.0	----	---
District	-0.67	1,500	653	43.0	847	57.0
School	-0.69	7,500	1,738	23.0	2,906	77.0

* The sample sites in this table represent the four sites with the highest and lowest implementation indexes, as well as the two sites that were just above and below the average inplemtation index score for the entire sample.

- Whereas school-sponsored sites generally had higher implementation indexes than district-sponsored sites, there was no systematic relationship between the sites' indexes and their total funding and spending patterns.

three of the sites with the lowest scores were district-grant programs. Overall, there was a significant variation between school-sponsored and district-sponsored programs.

Program Funding

Hypothesis two tested whether funding level influenced successful implementation. It also tested whether implementation varied by how total funding was divided among material and personnel expenditures. Total funding was computed from the PIP proposal.* Funding variations for the twelve selected sites are also displayed in Table 2.

Table 2 indicates that the amount of money allocated was not significant in determining the success of program implementation. The site which scored highest in the implementation index scale (2.69) received the same amount of funding ($7,500) as the site with the lowest implementation index (-0.69). Likewise, a site with a total amount of funding of $5,000 had a higher implementation index (1.34), than another site that received $9,000 and had an implementation index of -0.65. These data were substantiated by the finding that the correlation between implementation variables and the amount of funding allocated was not significant (r=.13), i.e.--there was no relationship between program implementation and the amount of monies spent on personnel and materials.

---

* Ideally total funding should include money allocated by the O.P.I. and other sources of funding. However, data requests related to outside funding on the O.E.R. survey were not always supplied by coordinators and therefore only O.P.I. funding is reported.

Program Planning

Hypothesis three tested the relationship between the level of program implementation as indicated by the implementation index and the degree to which a particular program characteristic labelled "parent concerns and needs" was present. The composite variable "parent concerns and needs" was computed by totalling the various types of activities held at the PIP sites. A total score of 10 was given to this composite variable. The scores for the 58 sites ranged from 0 to 10. The average score was 6.3.*

Three of the sites in Appendix Table 2 with the highest implementation index score were sites with high "parent concerns and needs" scores (8, 9, and 7 respectively). Only one site with a high implementation index had a low score, 4, for the composite variable. In contrast, two sites in Appendix Table 2 with low implementation index scores of -0.57 and -0.65 also showed low composite variable scores of 4 and 5. Overall, programs with a higher score for the composite variable "parent concerns and needs" had a higher level of implementation.

SITE CONDITIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Staff support

Hypothesis four tested whether PIP sites with staff support would have a higher level of program implementation than sites

---

* The parent concerns and needs score was derived from a selection of data from questions in the proposal and the coordinator survey. The proposal question asked if parents participated in the planning of the program, while the coordinator survey question (#6) asked for the specific role parents had, if any, in developing and implementing the program. A selection of the most frequent activities implemented at each site was also made.

that did not have staff support. Staff support was calculated by averaging the sum of scores from 49 separate items indicating types of staff support in questions 4, 5, 12, and 13 of the O.E.R. coordinator survey. The average score for the entire study sample was 0.52. (See Appendix B for the survey form).

Parent participation in school policy-making

Hypothesis five tested whether PIP sites with a high level of parent involvement in school policy-making will have a higher level of program implementation than sites with low parent involvement. Measures of parent involvement in school policy-making were calculated through an average score of the sum of 16 items on the O.E.R. coordinator's survey. The average score for the entire sample was 0.46. O.E.R. found no significant relationship between the level of parent involvement in school policy-making and program implementation.

CONCLUSION

The implementation index score was only found to be significantly correlated with program sponsorship. Moreover, whereas there appeared to be a relationship between the implementation index and the "parents concerns and needs" variable, the index was not related to a site's level of funding, or the extent to which parents participated in school policy-making, or the level of staff support for parent involvement. These aspects are more appropriately measured through methods which directly assess these variables rather than by simply relying on activity and attendance indicators.

APPENDIX B

O.E.R.'s "SCHOOL COORDINATOR SURVEY"

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

1991-92 PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM (PIP)

SCHOOL COORDINATOR SURVEY

Dear Parent Involvement Program Coordinator

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment is evaluating the Parent Involvement Program (PIP). Our goal is to learn how to improve future program implementation. Please answer all questions as completely as possible. It should only take 15 minutes of your time.

Please return the survey by June 19 to Mabel Payne, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, Research Unit, 110 Livingston Street, Room 507, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call Mabel Payne, Research Unit Manager, or two staff members Carolle Charles or Pamela Wheaton at 718-935-5242.

Please answer the questions by putting a check mark ( ) in the space next to the answer of your choice.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Check the years that your school received PIP funds.

1987-88 ____
1988-89 ____
1988-90 ____
1990-91 ____
1991-92 ____

2. Please check your current position.

School principal ____
Assistant principal ____
Teacher ____
Guidance Counselor/Social Worker ____
Other (Please specify)
_____ ____

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The following questions address the implementation of PIP activities at your school.

1. What is your role in implementing the program? Please check ALL responses that apply to you.

A._____ Participated in development of proposal
B._____ Wrote proposal
C._____ Conducted needs assessment or parent survey for program planning
D._____ Planned trips
E._____ Planned activities
F._____ Obtained resources for program (speakers, materials, etc.)
G._____ Prepared materials and supplies
H._____ Coordinated PIP activities with school staff
I._____ Coordinated PIP activities with parent volunteers
J._____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in school
K._____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in district
L._____ Conducted workshop(s)
M._____ Lead PIP staff meetings
N._____ Lead PIP parent meetings
O._____ Participated in recruiting PIP parents
P._____ Other, please explain

2. Do you think you were adequately prepared to implement the program?

Yes____
No ____

If no, please explain.

3. Who else participated in implementing the program in your school? Please check ALL responses that apply.

School administrators ____
District administrators ____
Central administrators ____
Teachers ____
Parents ____
Other (please specify) ____

4. What role did the principal play in implementing the program in your school? Please check ALL responses that apply. (If you are the principal, skip this question.)

A._____ Participated in development of proposal
B._____ Wrote proposal
C._____ Conducted needs assessment or parent survey for program planning
D._____ Planned trips
E._____ Planned activities
F._____ Obtained resources for Program (speakers, materials, etc.)
G._____ Prepared materials and supplies
H._____ Coordinated PIP activities with school staff
I._____ Coordinated PIP activities with parent volunteers
J._____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in school
K._____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in district
L._____ Conducted workshop(s)
M._____ Lead PIP staff meetings
N._____ Lead PIP parent meetings
O._____ Participated in recruiting PIP parents
P._____ Other, please explain.

5. What role did other school staff (other than yourself or the principal) play in implementing the program? Please check ALL responses that apply to your school.

A _____ Participated in development of proposal
B _____ Wrote proposal
C _____ Conducted needs assessment or parent survey for program planning
D _____ Planned trips
E _____ Planned activities
F _____ Obtained resources for program implementation (speakers, materials, etc.)
G _____ Prepared materials and supplies
H _____ Coordinated PIP activities with school staff
I _____ Coordinated PIP activities with PA/PTA
J _____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in school
K _____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in district
L _____ Taught workshop(s)
M _____ Lead PIP staff meetings
N _____ Lead PIP parent meetings
O _____ Participated in recruiting PIP parents
P _____ Other, please explain.

6. What role did parents play in implementing the program? Please check ALL responses that apply to your school.

A. _____ Participated in development of proposal
B. _____ Wrote proposal
C. _____ Conducted needs assessment or parent survey for program planning
D. _____ Planned trips
E. _____ Planned activities
F. _____ Obtained resources for program implementation (speakers, materials, etc.)
G. _____ Prepared materials and supplies
H. _____ Coordinated PIP activities with school staff
I. _____ Coordinated PIP activities with PA/PTA
J. _____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in school
K. _____ Coordinated PIP activities with other parent activities in district
L. _____ Taught workshop(s)
M. _____ Lead PIP staff meetings
N. _____ Lead PIP parent meetings
O. _____ Participated in recruiting PIP parents
P. _____ Other, please explain

7. How did you notify parents about PIP activities? Please check ALL responses that apply.

A. _____ By telephone
B. _____ Sent notices home with students
C. _____ Made announcements to students in classrooms
D. _____ Distributed flyers in buildings and stores in catchment area
E. _____ Made announcements at community meetings
F. _____ Other, please explain.

8. Has your program received assistance or funding from any other sources?

Yes _____
No _____

If yes, please describe the amount of funding and the source.

9. How clear did you find the program guidelines, that is, procedures for implementing the program? Please CIRCLE ONE choice on the following scale where completely clear means that program guidelines were easy to understand, and completely unclear means that program guidelines were difficult to interpret.

Completely unclear 1 2 3 4 Completely clear

Please explain.

10. Overall how would you rate the level of principal support provided? Please CIRCLE ONE choice on the following scale where very supportive means that the principal played a key role in implementing the program, and not supportive means that the principal was not involved in program implementation.

Not supportive 1 2 3 4 Very supportive

11. Overall how would you rate the level of school staff support provided? Please CIRCLE ONE choice on the following scale where very supportive means that school staff played key roles in implementing the program, and not supportive means that school staff were not involved in program implementation.

Not supportive 1 2 3 4 Very supportive

A lot of circumstances contribute to the success or difficulties with program implementation. The following two questions address the elements that you think facilitated or hindered program implementation.

12. What features of the program implementation do you think contributed to the successful aspects of your program? Please check ALL activities that you think contributed to the success of your program.

A. _____ Parent participation in planning the program
B. _____ PA/PTA participation in planning the program
C. _____ Surveys of parents for planning the program
D. _____ School administration participation in planning the program
E. _____ School staff participation in planning the program
F. _____ Distribution of funds in a timely manner
G. _____ Procedures for accessing funds
H. _____ Amount of funding providing
I. _____ Materials obtained for program implementation
J. _____ Staff/personnel implementing the program
K. _____ Administrative/principal support for the program
L. _____ Training for staff/personnel implementing the program
M. _____ The method for contacting parents about PIP activities
N. _____ The method for receiving feedback from parents about PIP activities
O. _____ Foreign language translation for communicating with parents
P. _____ Coordination with other parent involvement programs in your school
Q. _____ Networking with other parent involvement programs in other schools
R. _____ Other, please explain.

12.1. Of the responses you checked, which TWO were the most important? Please explain.

13. What features of the program implementation do you think have been problematic? Please check ALL responses that you think were obstacles to successful program implementation at your school.

A. _____ Too little parent participation in planning the program
B. _____ Too little PA/PTA participation in planning the program
C. _____ The lack of surveys of parents for planning the program
D. _____ Too little school staff participation in planning the program
E. _____ Too little school administration participation in planning the program
F. _____ The distribution of funds in a timely manner
G. _____ Procedures for accessing funds
H. _____ Amount of funding provided
I. _____ Materials obtained for program implementation
J. _____ Staff/personnel implementing the program
K. _____ Administrative/principal support for the program
L. _____ Training for staff/personnel implementing the program
M. _____ Methods for contacting parents about PIP activities
N. _____ Methods for receiving feedback from parents about PIP activities
O. _____ Foreign language translation for communicating with parents
P. _____ Coordination with other parent involvement programs in your school
Q. _____ Networking with other parent involvement programs in other schools
R. _____ Other, please explain

13.1 Of the responses you checked, which TWO were the biggest obstacles? Please explain.

14. Other than PIP, how are parents involved in your school? Please check ALL responses that apply to your school.

PA/PTA _____
Parent-teacher conferences _____
Volunteers _____
School-based Management _____
Chapter 1 parent advisory committee _____
Chapter 1 school wide committee _____
Other, please specify _____

15. Since PIP began, has the number of parents involved in your school increased? (include PTA, school volunteers, parent-teacher conferences)

Yes _____
No _____

Please explain.

16. How do you think the school and school personnel have benefitted from PIP?

17. How would you rate the level of success of your PIP activities? Please CIRCLE ONE choice on the following scale where very successful means that all program objectives were satisfied, and not successful means no program objectives were satisfied.

Not successful 1 2 3 4 Very successful

Please explain.

III. DISTRICT INFORMATION

The following questions address the role the district played in PIP implementation.

1. What support had the district office or the superintendent provided for implementing PIP? Please check ALL responses that apply to your program.

A. _____ Facilitated accessing PIP funds
B. _____ Assisted with purchasing for PIP activities
C. _____ Provided technical assistance
D. _____ Conducted presentations at PIP activities
E. _____ Attended PIP activities
F. _____ Requested information about PIP
G. _____ Other, please explain

2. What roles have school board members played in implementing PIP? Please check ALL responses that apply to your program.

A. _____ Facilitated accessing PIP funds
B. _____ Provided technical assistance
C. _____ Conducted presentations at PIP activities
D. _____ Attended PIP activities
E. _____ Requested information about PIP
F. _____ Other, please explain

3. How would you rate overall district support? Please CIRCLE ONE choice on the following scale where very supportive means the district played a key role in implementing the program, and not supportive means the district was not involved in program implementation.

Not supportive 1 2 3 4 Very supportive

IV. GENERAL

1. Do you have any comments or suggestions for future PIP activities?

2. Is there anything else that you would like to add, that you have been unable to address in this questionnaire?

REFERENCES

Abramson, Lisa, Parent Involvement Program Implementation in New York City Public Schools. Ph.D dissertation thesis. NY: New York University, Graduate School of Public Service, 1992.

Brandt, Ron, "On Parents and Schools: An Interview with Joyce Epstein," Educational Leadership, October 1989, pp 24-27.

Comer, James, "Educating Poor Minority Children," Scientific American November, pp. 42-48.

Davies, Don, "Schools Reaching Out: Family, School, and Community Partnerships For Student Success," Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1991, pp. 376-382.

Edwards, Patricia A., and Lauren S. Jones Young, "Beyond Parents: Family, Community, and School Involvement," Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1992.

Epstein, Joyce L. ed., "Parent Involvement: A Special Section," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1991.

Epstein, Joyce L., "Parental Involvement: What Research Says to Administrators." Education and Urban Society, 1987, 19 (2, February) pp. 119-136.

Henderson, Anne T. "Parents Are A School's Best Friends". Phi Delta Kappan, October 1988, pp. 148-153.

Henning-Stout, Mary, and Linda A. Goode, "Parent Involvement in a Low-Income Neighborhood Primary School: A Program Illustration," Parent Partners New York State Education Department, 1986.

Jackson, Barbara L, Don Davies, Bruce S. Cooper, and Jennifer A. Page, "Parents Make a Difference: An Evaluation of New York City's 1987-88 Parent Involvement Program," Policy Report published by Fordham University Graduate School of Education and the Institute for Responsive Education, 1988.

McLaughlin, M.W., "Learning from Experience: Lessons from Policy Implementation," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1987.

Office of Parent Involvement. Status Report (July 1, 1991-January 31, 1992), New York City Board of Education, 1992.

Seeley, David, John Niemeyer, J.H., and Richard Greenspan, Principals Speak (Report #2), New York, July 1991.

Wikelund, Karen Reed, Schools and Communities together: A Guide to Parent Involvement. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Oregon, 1990.

Wlodkowski, Raymond and Judith Jaynes, Eager to Learn: Helping Children Become Motivated & Love Learning, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.